



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

mv  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/832,739	04/11/2001	Dana Eagles	2126-165	3502

20999 7590 06/20/2003

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG  
745 FIFTH AVENUE - 10TH FL.  
NEW YORK, NY 10151

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

WRIGHT, ANDREW D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3617	

DATE MAILED: 06/20/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Act**

Application No.	09/832,739	
Examiner	Art Unit Andrew Wright	
3617		

*-The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address -*

THE REPLY FILED 27 May 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
  - (a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) 29,31-45,47 and 80-82 would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 29,31-45,47,62-66 and 80-82.

Claim(s) objected to: 7-11,13-17,27 and 28.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-6,12,18-26 and 67-74.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 49-61.

8.  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is a)a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.
9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding claim 67, applicant argues that the claim language is such that the fabric must be impervious to water. The claim language, however, can be construed as the pair, water and other fluids, in the alternative with fluidisable materials. To read on the claim a reference structure must be impervious to water and other fluids OR impervious to fluidisable materials.

Regarding claim 1, applicant argues that the stiffening beams are intended to be pressurized with air or other medium, and that the beams are subject to pressurization independent of the pressure of the vessel. The pressurization features upon which applicant relies in the arguments are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Regarding claims 68 and 69, applicant argues that there is no motivation to combine. Nishizawa discloses a woven bag that can be filled with fluidisable material, but does not disclose a means for filling. One using the Nishizawa apparatus would necessarily have to decide on a means for filling the bag. Hawthorne discloses a means for filling a woven bag. Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the motivation is found in the knowledge generally available to the skilled artisan.

Regarding claim 71, applicant argues that neither Hawthorne nor Ashton provide a sleeve, and further argue that the sleeves of the instant invention provide greater reinforcement and secure the position to prevent drag. Ashton discloses a structure that falls within the broad definition of the term "sleeve". The features upon which applicant relies in the arguments are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims.

AM 6/19/03

  
S. JOSEPH MORANO  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

6/19/03